

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-11 and 13-22 are pending in the application with 1, 11 and 17 being independent. Claims 1, 11 and 17 have been amended, and claim 23 has been cancelled.

The official action rejected claims 1, 3, 5-11, 13, 14 and 17-22 under U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Glaser et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,428,769).¹ The official action objected to claims 9, 10, 15, 16 and 23 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated claims 9, 10, 15, 16 and 23 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The applicants greatly appreciate and thank the examiner for the indication of allowability of claims 9, 10, 15, 16 and 23, and respectfully submit that the above amendments place claims 1, 3, 5-11 and 13-22 in condition for allowance. Independent claims 1, 11 and 17 have been amended to incorporate the features of allowable claim 23. Accordingly, the allowability of claim 23, as indicated in the action, causes claims 1, 11 and 17, and all claims depending therefrom, to be in allowable form.

Three (3) independent claims remain in the application as previously paid for, and nineteen (19) total claims remain in the application as previously paid for. This response is being filed with a one-month extension of time and fee. The applicants believe no additional fee is due. However, the commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the amount enclosed or any additional fees which may be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 13-2855. Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form, in an effort to advance this application towards allowance, the examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

Dated: October 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Aaron M. Peters

Registration No.: 48,801

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicants

¹ Although page 2 of the action states that claims 1, 3, 5-11 and 13-23 are rejected, the action does not provide reasons for rejecting claims 9, 10, 15, 16 and 23, and instead notes that claims 9, 10, 15, 16 and 23 are simply objected to in the Office Action Summary and indicates claims 9, 10, 15, 16 and 23 are allowable on page 4 of the action. Accordingly, it is presumed the rejection only applied to claims 1, 3, 5-11, 13, 14 and 17-22.